

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/783,276	02/20/2004	Mitch Junkins	015714.0033US1	7619
34284 7	590 11/16/2005		EXAMINER	
ROBERT D. FISH RUTAN & TUCKER LLP		O'CONNOR, CARY E		
611 ANTON BLVD 14TH FLOOR		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
COSTA MESA	, CA 92626-1931		3732	

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		XP.	
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/783,276	JUNKINS	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Cary E. O'Connor	3732	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RETHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, and If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by some Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON.  R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a rent.  a reply within the statutory minimum of thirtyeriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tatute, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed  y (30) days will be considered timely.  THS from the mailing date of this communication.  ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
<ul> <li>1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on Q</li> <li>2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) Since this application is in condition for allocation accordance with the practice und</li> </ul>	This action is non-final.  Dwance except for formal matte		
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-13 and 21-23 is/are pending in 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-13,21 and 22 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 23 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction are	drawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.		
<del>-</del> 1 1	accepted or b) objected to be		
Applicant may not request that any objection to	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	• •	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	E Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action of form F10-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Bu	nents have been received. nents have been received in Appriority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the certified copies not	eceived.	
Attachment(s)			
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		ummary (PTO-413)	
<ol> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SE Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ol>	′	)/Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152) 	

## AIT OTHE. 37.32

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Claim Objections

The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

Misnumbered claims 21 and 22 have been renumbered 22 and 23.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bergman (2002/017057). Bergman shows a flossing device comprising a pair of times between which a length of floss 30 is strung, a quick-release mechanism 24 having an actuating arm disposed with a neck of the flossing device, wherein movement of the actuating arm releases tension of the length of floss.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bushberger (5,267,579) in view of Murayama (5,343,883) and Romanus (5,188,133). Bushberger shows a flossing device comprising an internal supply of floss 52, a pair of tines between which a length of the floss is strung, and a vibration source. Bushberger does not specify the frequency of the vibrations produced by the vibration source. Murayama shows a flossing device having a vibration source which causes the floss to vibrate. Murayama discloses that the frequency produced by the vibration source may be between 2000 and 20,000 Hz (column 6, lines 24-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made produce vibrations by the vibration source of Bushberger in frequencies between 2000 and 20,000 Hz, in view of Murayama, in order to effectively clean the teeth. The flossing devices of Bushberger and Murayama do not include a user-operable actuator coupled to the tines that changes the tension of the floss without unwinding or winding the floss. Romanus shows a flossing device comprising a user-operable actuator 16 which changes the tension on the floss without winding or unwinding the floss. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the flossing device of Bushberger as modified by Murayama with a user-operable actuator

Application/Control Number:

10/783,276 Art Unit: 3732

coupled to the tines that changes the tension of the floss without unwinding or winding the floss, as taught by Romanus, so that a strong tension may be maintained on the floss to facilitate flossing. As to claim 5, note that the vibration source of Bushberger may be an eccentric weight (column 5, lines 58). As to claim 7, Bushberger and Murayama discloses the claimed invention except for the cutting blade located on the tines (the cutting blade 65 of Bushberger is located on the handle). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to place the cutter of Bushberger on a tine, since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. In re Japikse, 86 USPQ 70. As to claim 8, note that the floss supply is a spool of floss 52 (column 4, line 54). As to claim 12, note that the floss of Romanus is advanced by an electrically powered motor 100.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Bushberger (5,267,579) in view of Murayama (5,343,883) and Romanus (5,188,133) as

applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Thackrey (4,555,697). The devices of

Bushberger or Murayama do not utilize an electromagnetic buzzer as the vibration

source. Thackrey shows a orally held vibration alarm wherein the vibration source is an

electromagnetic buzzer 3 (column 3, line 19). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the vibration

source of Bushberger with an electromagnetic buzzer, in view of Thackrey, because it is

more lightweight than the motor/eccentric weight arrangement.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergman (2002/0170570) in view of Bushberger (5,267,579). The device of Bergman

does not include a vibration source coupled to the tines. Bushberger shows a flossing device having a vibration source coupled to the tines. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the device of Bergman with a vibration source, as taught by Bushberger, in order to aid in the effective cleaning between the teeth.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 23 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### Specification

The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code (page 5). Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

# Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cary E. O'Connor whose telephone number is 571-272-4715. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:00-3:30.

10/783,276 Art Unit: 3732

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Shaver can be reached on 571-272-4720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Carly E. O'Connor Primary Examiner Art Unit 3732

ceo